



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/766,789	01/22/2001	Chengwen Robert Chu	343355600020	8356

7590 10/25/2007
Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114

EXAMINER

LE, DEBBIE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2168

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/25/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09766789	1/22/01	CHU ET AL.	343355600020

EXAMINER

DEBBIE M. LE

ART UNIT**PAPER**

2168

20071002

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

This is a letter to inform you that we made a minor change to the previous Examiner's Answer to add section (11) Re;ated Proceeding(s) Appendix. Please see attached sheet (page 25) of the Examiner's Answer.

*Debbie M. Le***DEBBIE LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER***10/2/07*

II). The Anwar's reference does not need to concern the same problem as the appellant's try to solve because recognizing another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious.

Appellant argues that Anwar reference is concerned with a different problem than that appellant's claim 1 is directed because for example, Anwar reference is concerned about using "a decision tree generator where the number of dependent variables is greater than one" (see appellant's brief page 8, paragraph 4).

In response to appellant's argument that Anwar reference is concerned with a different problem than that appellant's claim 1, the fact that appellant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). In this particular case, the feature that both Anwar and the appellant have been tried to solve is using the automatic method to split (selecting) a subset of the dimension variables in the multidimensional database (e.g., data warehouse, OLAP) because the OLAP stores large volumes of transactional data generated by enterprises.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

None.